

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Speaker, the House just passed the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act which will protect the unborn from some heinous conduct by certain physicians. I know I have good colleagues. There are good citizens on both sides of the abortion issue, and they are heartfelt. But a free, honest, and caring society cannot, at any term, tolerate the conduct by the physician in Philadelphia and those like him who would create the most savage, barbaric abortion methods to take the life of children that were 20 weeks or older.

This bill goes a long way toward addressing that cruelty that we cannot let stand in this country. I'm proud of my colleagues who voted for it this evening, and I appreciate the passage of this bill.

FARRM ACT WILL SERVE AMERICA WELL

(Mr. ROONEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the 2013 FARRM Bill, which will help ensure a safe, affordable, and abundant food supply for all Americans. I represent one of the largest agricultural districts east of the Mississippi, and I'm proud to represent Florida's dairy and vegetable farmers, citrus and sugar growers, and beef cattle ranchers. This bill will serve them well, and it will serve Florida's taxpayers well, too.

The FARRM Bill includes much-needed reforms to agricultural programs. It provides relief from unnecessary Federal mandates. It saves the taxpayers \$35 billion and reduces the size of government by eliminating or consolidating more than 100 programs.

In particular, I am pleased that this bill addresses the growing problem in my district of citrus disease. Diseases like greening have already wiped out over one-quarter of the citrus acreage in Florida. If we don't reverse this trend soon, we won't have enough crop to sustain our existing processing plants, and the problem will only spiral from there. Florida will lose jobs and our economy will suffer. But this will impact all Americans, because if Florida isn't growing oranges, you won't be putting orange juice on your breakfast table.

Mr. Speaker, if we want to have a safe, abundant, and affordable food supply, we need to pass the FARRM Bill.

□ 1900

DREDGING OUR NATION'S SMALL PORTS

(Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring attention to the issue of dredging our Nation's small ports, a critical issue for hard-

working folks in Washington State, southwest Washington, in particular, in Wahkiakum County, Chinook, Ilwaco and other parts of my district.

This is a job issue in my region and for those along waterways throughout our Nation. The issue is this: ports are lifelines to several towns and communities across the Columbia River and the Pacific Coast in my district, and they are literally being choked off by lack of maintenance dredging.

One of my local newspapers, the Chinook Observer, commented, if a farmer were unable to ship his wheat because a road became impassable within our Federal highway system, the Federal Government would rightly fix this issue immediately.

It is no different for the dire circumstances facing our Nation's navigable waterways. We need to address this issue as soon as possible.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I've taken action in search of a swift solution. And thankfully, the committee included \$1 billion out of the Harbor Maintenance Trust Fund for dredging and maintenance of waterways in our Energy and Water Development appropriations bill.

We must maintain our Nation's maritime ports.

END HUNGER NOW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2013, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this time to address my colleagues about one of the most important issues that we face in this country, and that is hunger.

We have a problem in the United States of America, I'm sad to say, where we have 50 million of our fellow citizens who are hungry; 17 million are kids. This is the case in the richest, most powerful Nation on the planet.

We should be ashamed of ourselves. Food is not a luxury. It is a necessity, and everybody in this country ought to have a right to food, and that should not even be controversial.

Yet, we have a FARRM Bill that we will begin debating tomorrow that cuts SNAP, which used to be the food stamp program. It cuts it by \$20.5 billion. That's billion with a B.

What does that mean?

It means that 2 million people who currently receive the benefit today, tomorrow will lose it. It means that over 200,000 kids who are eligible for free breakfast and lunch at school today will lose that benefit tomorrow.

Those aren't my numbers. Those aren't the numbers of some liberal think tank. Those are the numbers by the Congressional Budget Office, CBO. They say that if the FARRM Bill passes, and if those numbers stay in, 2 million of our fellow citizens will lose their food benefit.

Mr. Speaker, I find that unconscionable. We are trying to emerge from one of the worst economic recessions in our history. Record job losses over the last few years. We've had people of all backgrounds lose their jobs, find themselves working now in jobs that don't pay very much, struggling, trying to keep their families afloat.

And one of the lifelines during this difficult economic time has been the SNAP program. It has enabled many families to be able to put food on the table.

You can't use SNAP to buy a flat-screen TV. You can't use SNAP to buy a car. You can only use SNAP to buy food. That's what this is all about.

And in the FARRM Bill, for whatever reason, it was decided that, rather than looking for savings in the crop insurance program, which we know is rife with abuse, rather than looking for savings in some of these special kind of giveaways to agribusinesses, these sweetheart deals, rather than trying to find savings there to put toward balancing our budget, it was decided to go after, almost exclusively, this one program, SNAP.

Mr. Speaker, I heard up in the Rules Committee, during our consideration of the amendments today, people, a number of people say, well, all we're doing is eliminating categorical eligibility.

A lot of people don't know what categorical eligibility is. A lot of people who are supporting these cuts don't know what categorical eligibility is.

Basically, this was a Republican idea to kind of streamline a lot of bureaucracy and paperwork at the State level. So if you qualified for welfare, then you would automatically be enrolled in the SNAP program. It doesn't mean you would automatically get a benefit. It means you would be enrolled in the program, and if you qualified for the benefit, you would get it.

It was kind of one-stop shopping for people who were poor, for people who found themselves experiencing a difficult situation.

It has saved States lots and lots and lots of money. It has made it easier for people, during these economic difficulties, to be able to get the benefits that, quite frankly, they're entitled to.

And so when you eliminate categorical eligibility, what do you do you put an extra burden on States. States will end up having to pay more for additional bureaucracy. There'll be more paperwork. There'll be more confusion.

The other thing that happens when you get rid of categorical eligibility is that you will make it more difficult for people who are eligible to get the benefit and, therefore, many people who are still experiencing tough times, who are eligible for a food benefit, will not be able to get it.

Mr. Speaker, this used to be a bipartisan issue. And I remember, during the 2008 farm bill, you know, one of the things that saved that farm bill was the food and nutrition part of the farm bill. Congresswoman ROSA DELAURIO,